

**John A. C. Greppin**

## EARLY GREEK HISTORICAL FRAGMENTS PERTINENT TO ARMENIAN MATTERS

Two of the many ancient statements about the Armenians stem not from the well-known Greek historians but from lesser luminaries, Hecataeus of Miletus and Eudoxus of Cnidus. Always when early Armenian history is being discussed, both Greek authors are promptly cited, Hecataeus because his statement has been called the most ancient written reference to the Armenians, and Eudoxus because his tying together of the Armenians and the Phrygians, even in their speech, is crucial to Armenian prehistory. Yet their statements, though accurately quoted, are troublesome, one because of a distinct error in reporting, and the other because of a vacuum of knowledge surrounding the circumstances. It is therefore appropriate to consider anew these statements and the environment they appear in.

The Greeks referred occasionally to the Armenians in their historical and geographical writings, the best known sources being Strabo, Xenophon, and Herodotus. Additional valuable information also appears in what are called Greek historical fragments, residue of early authors whose whole manuscripts have been lost but whose legacy has been continued by later writers who quoted them. Stephanus of Byzantium is a source of some of these fragments, for in his *Ethica* he derived a large portion of his facts from earlier Greek historians and geographers. And Stephanus, being a respectable scholar, usually gave credit to his sources.

In discussions of early references to the Armenians, modern historians (Adontz 1946.328, Diakonoff 1968.217, Grousset 1947.74, Toumanoff 1963.64 n. 61) seem to cite Hecataeus without reference to his actual source. Others (Der Nersessian 1969.20, Brentjes 1974 [76].47, 206) give Hecataeus's date as 550, a full thirty years before mention of the Armenians is made by Darius the Great at Bisitun. Hecataeus and the date 550 B.C. have lately been canonized and made part of twentieth-century Armenian historiography. This is entirely

wrong in one respect and misleading in another. First of all, the date cannot be 550 B.C. Second, in spite of the repeated statements of contemporary Armenian historians, the corpus of Hecataeus is no longer intact and we derive our material referent to him from piecemeal scholarship of a later date. In the case of the statement by Hecataeus, that the Armenians lived to the south of a people known as the Chalybes,<sup>1</sup> our actual citation is derived from none other than Stephanus of Byzantium, a Greek grammarian who probably flourished in the late fifth and early sixth century A.D., a full millennium after the time of Hecataeus. Stephanus's work, the *Ethnica*, was composed in sixty volumes and gave an alphabetical list of geographical place-names. We no longer have the whole of Stephanus, but the surviving epitome was probably compiled somewhere between the seventh and the tenth century A.D. Thus, the history of this ultimate recension of Hecataeus which has come down to us is most vague. And, since the remaining text we have of Stephanus is greatly reduced from earlier volumes, the fragments that we in turn attribute to Hecataeus via Stephanus are in fact remnants compiled as much as five hundred years after Stephanus's time. Stephanus in turn used a text that was first prepared a thousand years earlier. Thus our material by Hecataeus has come down to us in manuscript form after fifteen hundred years of distillation. Viewed even with a small degree of objectivity, our Hecataean fragments are third hand and of insecure authority.

There are three principal modern sources for the fragments of Hecataeus. Karl Müller's *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum* (1878-1885) was the first modern authoritative study of all the Greek historical fragments. Published in five volumes, it lists with Latin translation but without commentary all the material that was then available. This edition is still of value, not only for its Latin translation but also because it has a rather exhaustive index which makes acquisition of material fairly simple. Müller was followed by the indefatigable F. Jacoby who again analyzed all the fragments (1923-1964 [posthumous]) and added a copious and valuable commentary on all passages. Most recently, a separate edition of Hecataeus alone has appeared (Nenci, 1954), containing newly discovered fragments, and a critical reworking of the other known fragments. When working on the fragments of Hecataeus all three editions are necessary.

Hecataeus is remembered for two works, the *Periegesis* (Gēs Periodos), a guide to the known world, and a mythographic work which is called variously the *Geneōlogiai*, *Historiai* or the *Hērōologia*. It is the *Periegesis* that is of importance to us for in it our reference to the Chalybes and the Armenians appears.

Hecataeus is probably the earliest Greek geographer from whom we have any written legacy. Scraps of his writings appear in Strabo, Aelian, Heraclitus as well as Stephanus (whence our greatest bulk) and some other lesser names. References in Latin are quite scant, unsure fragments being found in Pliny (*Natural History*), Ammianus Marcellinus, and a scholiast on Lucan. The *Periegesis* is divided into two broad segments, Europe and Asia. These sections can further be reduced to several subsections, beginning with western Europe, and passing on to Italy, Greece, Thrace, Asia Minor, the eastern Mediterranean littoral, Egypt, and closing with Ethiopia and Lydia. In the section Asia the well-known comment on the Armenians appears as well as some other comments influential on Armenian prehistory.<sup>2</sup> It is clear, however, that this section is corrupt; there has even been argument that it is entirely fraudulent. The accuracy of the first claim is easily demonstrated; the second is subject to some debate. Much of what Hecataeus says about Asia is difficult to confirm or deny since Hecataeus is often the only writer to give us some particular information. In the subsection on Italy we can clearly document passages where Stephanus has reported Hecataeus unfaithfully. According to Stephanus, Hecataeus says that Capua and Capri are, respectively, a city and an island in Italy. We know that this cannot be Hecataeus speaking. Pearson (1939.40) points out quite carefully that in the late sixth century B.C. the boundaries of Italy could not have extended as far as Campania. This is sure evidence of meddling on someone's part, and is a sample of the inaccuracy that the purported work of Hecataeus displayed in 500 A.D. when Stephanus was drawing on it. In Fragment 93,<sup>3</sup> which is part of the section dealing with the coast of the Adriatic, the statement attributed to Hecataeus about the Illyrian tribe of the Liburni must be a later addition, possibly by Stephanus, since as Pearson points out (1939.48, n.2), "Hecataeus would not have defined their position in such terms once his description of the Illyrian tribes had started." It is more difficult to disprove later additions to Hecataeus in the section Asia since much of the material mentioned is in itself quite baffling and sometimes incomprehensible. For instance, the town Teiria<sup>4</sup> is not otherwise known; the Ethiopian tribe of the so-called Sciapodes<sup>5</sup> similarly is reported by no one else. A number of confirmable statements in Hecataeus, however, are, at best, curious and troubled by anachronistic error or a lack of consistency which must imply that the later quoters of Hecataeus are not always being faithful to their source. This has even raised the question of whether a complete or near complete edition of Hecataeus existed for Stephanus to draw on.

Hecataeus was clearly an obscure author by the time of the Alexandrians. Athenaeus, speaking at a later date,<sup>6</sup> says that Callimachus ascribed the *Asia* to a certain Nesiotes. Arrian<sup>7</sup> is similarly hesitant about the authorship. It seems that even two hundred and fifty years after the writing of the *Periegesis* the authenticity of the received text was doubted. That the book lacked favor in the Golden Age and later is not difficult to understand. Hecataeus pioneered a particular syntactic style, one of abrupt short sentences with little use of subordination (Tozzi. 1964). This style was rapidly to decline in favor, especially in view of the more florid oratorical style that was to develop in Greek literature in the following hundred years. Thus, stylistically sensitive readers turned from Hecataeus to Herodotus and Thucydides for their pleasure and information. It seems that by the time Callimachus was in charge of the Library at Alexandria (ca. 250 B.C.), Hecataeus was all but forgotten. He could never be completely abandoned since he was quoted four times in Herodotus, though usually with opprobrium.<sup>8</sup>

Although it is the section *Asia* that is the most suspect, nineteenth-century scholarship raised the question whether the work as a whole was a forgery. This was not, basically, an impossible assertion. Forgeries in the Alexandrian library no doubt existed. Travelers from Asia Minor would surely bring fraudulent works to Alexandria which would initially whet the appetite of any librarian and possibly deceive him as well. A number of such works certainly found a place on the shelves where they were used by the unwary. Cobet (1883) reintroduced to modern scholarship the question of authenticity, basing his doubts on certain passages that resembled statements in Herodotus. These, along with others, he felt were evidence of forgery. Later, Wells (1909) weighed suspiciously the evidence presented by Cobet and tentatively confirmed the validity of the bulk of the Hecataean corpus. The matter seems to have been largely resolved when Jacoby (1923.318) showed that the negative evidence was simply too weak to be of interest. Thus the fragments attributed to Hecataeus are probably attributed correctly. However, because of obvious errors and inconsistencies in the text, we should assume that the Hecataean corpus was transmitted unreliably up to the time of Stephanus. Further, we are not able to accept with confidence the residue of Hecataeus that was relayed to us in truncated form in the Byzantine epitome of Stephanus. The body of Hecataean material we now possess traveled with little respect through a millennium and a half and was grossly subject to scribal malfeasance.

The second difficulty about contemporary Armenian historiographers' references to Hecataeus is the date used: 550 B.C. It

cannot be that early. Happily, we do know something about the life of Hecataeus, and what we know makes so early a date not only unlikely but impossible. Herodotus (5.36) in his discussion of the Ionian revolt (500 B.C.), tells us that Hecataeus actively advised against starting a war with the Persian king, advice that was, of course, not heeded. Second, in the *Suidas*,<sup>9</sup> we are told that Hecataeus flourished at the time of the 65th Olympiad (520-516 B.C.), a date a full twenty years before his role in the Ionian revolt. This fairly well tells us that a date of 550 B.C. is far too early. We must prefer to say that the true date of the *Asia* falls between 520 and 500 B.C., thus being, at the earliest, coeval with Darius, and more probably later.<sup>10</sup> The claim of Der Nersessian and Brentjes must be put aside as ill-conceived.

The second of the two fabled statements about the Armenians comes from Eudoxus of Cnidus where reference is made to Armeno-Phrygian relationships.<sup>11</sup> Again, like Hecataeus, Eudoxus exists in fragments only, and, again, the fragment about the Phrygians is derived from Stephanus of Byzantium. Although the same problems about the textual tradition of Stephanus mentioned above apropos Hecataeus still apply, our textual tradition for Eudoxus up to the Byzantine period is considerably more secure than the textual tradition of Hecataeus. Principally Eudoxus was a mathematician, living ca. 395-340 B.C.; his works were of particular importance for astronomy and geography. In astronomy he dealt with the movement of the stars and planets, developing a theory of "homocentric spheres"<sup>12</sup>, a theory that showed good mathematics but poor astronomy. It is his *Gēs Períodos* that contains his Phrygian reference to the Armenians. Altogether, little modern scholarship has been devoted to it. The exception is F. Lasserre's (1966) collection of all the fragments of Eudoxus which provides a fairly thorough commentary and a translation of all the fragments into German.<sup>13</sup> The fragments are culled principally from Stephanus, but some also come from Strabo, Plutarch, Diogenes Laertius, Aelian, Callimachus, various scholiasts, and others. Latin citations are by Pliny (*NH*), Cicero, and Natalis Comes. Only half the fragments can be assigned to a definite book of the *Gēs Períodos*, of which there appear to be seven. Book One discusses the Scyths, Massagetae, the south Pontic Coast, Phrygia, Phoenicia, and Syria; Book Two, Egypt; Book Three, India and Persia; Book Four, the Balkans, Macedonia, and, perhaps through an error of manuscript tradition, the Scyths again; Book Five mentions the more remote parts of Greece: Boeotia and Thessaly; Book Six deals with other areas of Greece as well as Italy, Sicily, and Libya; Book Seven closes with a description of the Greek Isles and the Red Sea.

It is, of course, not at all unusual for an astronomer to be interested in terrestrial geography, and it must be remembered that Eudoxus was much more than an astronomer alone. Huxley (1963) points out that he was also a law-giver with extended interests in medicine and philosophy. He kept good company too, being an associate of Plato and Aristotle, and it has even been suggested that he was once in charge of the Academy at Athens (Jaeger 1948.16 n.2).

Little is known about the travels of Eudoxus except for his trips to Egypt where he stayed for some time and did some astronomical observations. He is also known to have done similar work in Italy and Sicily, but it is quite unlikely that he ever went into eastern Anatolia, much less India and Persia,<sup>14</sup> lands he reported on. His information was probably derived second hand from travelers and merchants. This is where the problems arise. Herodotus very pointedly stated that his own historical work was based on reasoned inquiry, not on hearsay and rumor. Obviously, such a statement could not have arisen without need, and Herodotus was responding to the feeling general in his time that much of what purported to be factual writing was more likely scuttlebutt. Eudoxus, in his writings about distant lands, was simply turning over to the Greek reader a collection of popular suppositions that were frequently unsupported in any significant sense. It is doubtful, though, that Eudoxus's statement about Armeno-Phrygian relationships falls into this class since he is supported by other authors, particularly Herodotus and, in a sense, Strabo.

Actually, two statements referring to the Armenians are attributed to Eudoxus, although the source of the second comment is not firmly attributable to Eudoxus, it being reported in Theophrastus's *De lapidibus* 44.<sup>15</sup> In it Eudoxus is supposed to have stated that the best whetstones come from Armenia. Without resolving the question of the original authorship of the statement, we can still assume that it probably is a true observation. Unlike statements derived from merchants and travelers, this statement has direct and important application to a craft and is thus quite likely not to fall into the classification of hearsay. Further, since it is repeated in an authoritative work (*De lapidibus*), it is all the more respectable.

## CONCLUSIONS

Greek historians wrote somewhat about the Armenians. Since there is frequently a gap between academic disciplines, in this case Classics and Armenology, not frequently Classical data will be falsely continued by contemporary Armenian historiographers. Specifically, our

reference to Hecataeus is erroneous, both on the issue of origin — the statement comes not directly from Hecataeus but from Stephanus of Byzantium — and on the question of date — Hecataeus probably wrote the *Periegesis* around 520-500 B.C., not 550 B.C. as so stated. Further, the whole of the Hecataean material is suspect because of gaps, acknowledged even in early times, in the textual tradition. The material we receive from Eudoxus, however, is of a different caliber. His Phrygian comment is repeated at least by one other ancient of good repute; and there is no reason to feel that Stephanus did not have a reliable manuscript to draw his information from. The second reported statement of Eudoxus, about whetstones, is more reliable still. It was repeated within a half century of the time Eudoxus originally put it down, and, further, it was reported in a specialized work on minerals. Eudoxus's statements are therefore of probable value, differing from the one statement attributed to Hecataeus which is poorly founded and entirely unsupported.<sup>16</sup>

The whole issue of Armenian references in the Greek historians, and especially in the early fragments, is in need of review. Although modern scholarship in Greek and Roman history has not offered us dramatic changes in our understanding of ancient eastern Anatolia, it has brought about refinements. These refinements must be included in the work of Armenologists, not because they will dramatically change our views but simply because they will make studies of preliterate Armenia more accurate. It is also necessary to unite such dim figures as Hecataeus and Eudoxus with the later mainstream of Classical Greek historiography as practiced by Herodotus, Strabo, and others, ancients whose data become increasingly valid as we learn to interpret them better.

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY  
CLEVELAND, OHIO

## NOTES

1. The statement is recorded in Nenci as no. 213, Jacoby no. 203, Müller no. 195. In Meineke's text of Stephanus of Byzantium it appears on pp. 685-686: "Chalybes: a tribe along the Black Sea on the Thermodon River. . . . The Armenians border upon the Chalybes on the south."

2. It is here that presumably we have our first reference to the Moschoi in Greek literature, a people whose identity is subject to considerable debate. They were first documented in the reign of Tiglath-Pileser I (ca. 1110), and Burney (1971.161) suspects that the first Moschoi are different than the later ones who are allied with King Midas.

This view is not shared by Mellaart (1978.80), an archaeologist famed for his excavation of Çatal Hüyük, who assigns without hesitation the Moschoi to Midas.

3. Jacoby; Nancy no. 102, Müller no. 61.

4. Nenci no. 211, Jacoby no. 201, Müller *vacat*.

5. Nenci no. 342, Jacoby no. 327, Müller no. 265.

6. In *The Deipnosophists* 2.70A: "Hecataeus of Miletus, in the *Description of Asia* (granting that this book is a genuine work of the historian, since Callimachus ascribes it to Nesiotes; whoever then the author may be), has the following."

7. *Anabasis of Alexander* 5.6.5: "Egypt also, the historians Herodotus and Hecataeus (though possibly the work on Egypt is by another than Hecataeus) both call similarly 'the gift of the river'..."

8. Herodotus rarely mentions anyone with approval; primarily, he presents older information and scholarship simply for the purpose of stating that it was wrong. It is unlikely though that he would scold a former giver of information if the subject of Herodotus's scorn were not of some stature.

9. Quoted among the *Testimonia*: Nenci no. 45, Jacoby no. 1, Müller *vacat*: "Hecataeus son of Hegesandrus, of Miletus:... at the time of the 65th Olympiad."

10. Pearson (1939.27) prefers to date the *Periegesis* in the last decade of the sixth century.

11. Lasserre no. 279. In Meineke's text of Stephanus of Byzantium it appears on p. 123: "Armenia, a land near the Persians. The inhabitants are Armenians; as Eudoxus says in the first book of his *Gēs Periódos*: 'Armenians are a tribe from Phrygia, and their speech is very similar. They supply stone with which they engrave and bore signets.'"

12. Recent work on this topic is by E. Maula 1974.

13. Earlier studies were by Brandes 1847 and Gissinger 1921. In the latter is a thorough *Forschungsgeschicht* from 1847 to 1921.

14. In Eudoxus's discussion of the Magi and Zoroaster it is clear that he has some basic ideas about the dualism of the Parses, and the alternating periods of three thousand years of Good and three thousand years of Evil. Using these numbers, Eudoxus dated the death of Zoroaster six thousand years before the death of Plato.

15. Lasserre 280 (Eichholz (1965.72) prefers to provide (βελτίστη)): "Moreover, the whetstone and the stone by means of which signets are carved are of similar, if not identical material. The best whetstones come from Armenia."

16. "Entirely" unsupported might be too strong a word, and perhaps the statement should read "not supported directly." Xenophon, in his then northward march from Media, records (*Anabasis* 5.5.1) that he passed through the same country of the Chalybes that Hecataeus mentions, and that he did so shortly after he had left the land of the Armenians. Xenophon does, in this way, support the statement of Hecataeus. It is also notable that the Greek biographer Plutarch (50-120 A.D.) calls the Chalybes 'Chaldians' (Lycurgus 14), an indeterminate term in the ancients' mouth that frequently included the Urartians.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADONTZ, N. *Histoire d'Arménie*. Paris, 1946.
- BRANDES, H. Über das Zeitalter des Astronomen Geminus und des Geographen Eudoxos," *Neue Jahrbuch für Philologie und Pädagogie*, Supplbd. 13 (= *Jahn's Archiv für Philologie und Pädagogie* 13). 1847. Pp. 199-230.
- BRENTJES, B. *Drei Jahrtausende Armenian*. Vienna, 1974.
- BURNEY, C., and D. M. LANG. *The Peoples of the Hills: Ancient Ararat and Caucasus*. London, 1971.
- COBET, C. G. "Hecataei Milesii, Scripta Pseudepigrapha," *Mnemosyne* 11 (1883), 1-7.
- DER NERSESSIAN, S. *The Armenians*. London, 1969.
- DIAKONOFF, I. M. *Predystorija armjanskogo naroda*. Erevan, 1968.
- EICHHOLZ, D. E. *Theophrastus de Lapidibus*. Oxford, 1965.
- GISSINGER, F. "Die Erdbeschreibung des Eudoxos von Knidos." *Stoikheia*, Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Weltbildes und der griechischen Wissenschaft, 6. Leipzig and Berlin, 1921.
- GROUSSET, R. *Histoire de l'Arménie des origines à 1071*. Paris, 1947.
- HUXLEY, G. "Studies in the Greek Astronomers," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 4 (1963), 83-96.
- JACOBY, F. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Vol. 1, Berlin 1923.
- JAEGER, W. *Aristotle, Fundamentals of the History of his Development*. Trans. R. Robinson. Oxford, 1948.
- LASSERRE, F. *Die Fragmente des Eudoxos von Knidos*. Berlin, 1966.
- MAULA, E. *Studies in Eudoxus' Homocentric Spheres*. Helsinki, 1974.
- MEINEKE, A. *Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum quae supersunt*. Berlin, 1849.
- MELLAART, J. *The Archaeology of Ancient Turkey*. London, 1978.
- MÜLLER, K. *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum*. Paris, 1878-1885.
- NENCI, G. *Hecataei Milesii fragmenta*. Florence, 1954.
- PEARSON, L. *Early Ionian Historians*. Oxford, 1939.
- TOZZI, T. "Studi su Ecateo di Mileto III, lingua e stile," *Athenaeum*, 42 (1964), 101-117.
- TOUMANOFF, C. *Studies in Christian Caucasian History*. Washington, D.C., 1963.
- WELLS, J. "The Genuineness of the Gēs Periōdos of Hecataeus," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 29 (1909), 41-52.